DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 210 CS 505 834

AUTHOR Benoit, William L.
TITLE Argumentation Theory. [A Selected Annotated Bibliography].
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.; Speech Communication Association, Annandale, Va.
PUB DATE Oct 85
NOTE 5p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Attitude Change; Communication Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; *Persuasive Discourse; Rhetoric; *Speech Communication; Teaching Methods; *Theories; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Argumentation Theory; Perelman (Chaim); *Rhetorical Theory

ABSTRACT

Materials dealing with aspects of argumentation theory are cited in this annotated bibliography. The 50 citations are organized by topic as follows: (1) argumentation; (2) the nature of argument; (3) traditional perspectives on argument; (4) argument diagrams; (5) Chaim Perelman's theory of rhetoric; (6) the evaluation of argument; (7) argument fields; (8) argument and attitude change; and (9) argument in interaction. (SKC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ARGUMENTATION THEORY

William L. Benoit
University of Missouri
October, 1985

ED289210

Distributed by the Speech Communication Module-ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, 5105 Backlick Road, Suite E, Annandale, VA 22003. This bibliography may be reproduced for free distribution without permission of the Speech Communication Module.

Books

Anderson, J. M., & Dovre, P. J. (Eds.) (1968). Readings in Argumentation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Traditional approach to argument.

Blair, J. A., & Johnson, R. H. (Eds.) (1980). Informal logic: The first international symposium. Inverness, CA: Edgepress. Essays on informal logic, fallacies, formalism, and pedagogy.

Cox, J. R., & Willard, C. A. (Eds.) (1982). Advances in argumentation theory and research. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. Contains, conceptual and methodological essays as well as studies of argument in a variety of contexts. Contains essays on many topics below.

Hamblin, C. L. (1970). Fallacies. London: Methuen. Classic treatment of fallacies, from ancient to modern times.

Johnson, R. H., & Blair, J. A. (1983). Logical self-defense. 2/e Toronto: McGraw Hill. An approach to informal logic.

Johnstone, H. W. (1959). Philosophy and argument. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. Philosophical discussion of argument, truth, validity, and self. See also Johnstone (1978).

Johnstone, H. W. (1978). Validity and rhetoric in philosophical argument: An outlook in transition. University Park, PA: Dialogue Press. Collected essays, revolving generally around the notion of philosophical argument as argument ad hominen--grappling with a position on the basis of its own assumptions.

Miller, G. R., & Nilsen, T. R. (Eds.) (1966). Perspectives on argumentation. Chicago: Scott, Foresman. Essays which adopt a traditional approach to argument.

Natanson, M., & Johnstone, H. W. (1965). Philosophy rhetoric and argumentation. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press. Philosophical essays on rhetoric, persuasion, and argumentation.

Peralman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation (Tr. J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. Argues that logicians have erred in ignoring actual argumentation in favor of the study of formal logic, and presents a rhetorical approach to argument.

Rhodes, J., & Newell, S. (Eds.) (1980). Proceedings of the summer conference on argumentation. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association. Papers grouped under heads of argument and the law, argument theory and criticism, and argument and forensics. Contains articles on many of the topics below.

Toulmin, S. (1958). The uses of argument. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Best known for chapters on the layout of arguments and argument fields.

CS 505 834

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1983). Speech acts in argumentative discussions. Dordrecht: Foris. Speech act theory applied to everyday argument.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (1984). The study of argumentation. New York: Irvington. General overview of argumentation, including chapters on Toulmin and Perelman.

Willard, C. A. (1983). Argumentation and the social grounds of knowledge. University: University of Alabama Press. An approach to epistemology through argumentation.

Zarefsky, D., Sillars, M. O, & Rhodes, J. (Eds.) (1983). Argument in Transition: Proceedings of the Third Summer Conference on Argumentation. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association. Contains articles on many of the topics below. ERIC ED 234 459(microfiche).

Ziegelmueller, G., & Rhodes, J. (Eds.) (1981). Dimensions of argument: Proceedings of the second summer conference on argumentation. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association. Papers grouped under the heads of fields, forensics, interpersonal, and philosophy. Contains articles on many of the topics below. ERIC ED 207 119(microfiche).

Articles

Nature of Argument

Brockriede, W. (1975). Where is argument? JAFA, 11, 179-82. Advances six characteristics of argument: inferential leap, rationale, competing claims, regulation of uncertainty, willingness to risk confrontation, and a shared frame of of reference.

Hample, D. (1980). A cognitive view of argument. JAFA, 16, 151-58. Argues that it can be useful to consider argument as a cognitive product of receivers. ERIC EJ 225 080.

Kneupper, C. W. (1991). Argument: A social constructivist perspective. JAFA, 17, 183-89. Articulates a social constructivist perspective on argument, including epistemic implications. ERIC EJ 250 931.

O'Keefe, D. J. (1977). Two concepts of argument. JAFA, 13, 121-28. Distinguished between "making" an argument1 and "having" an argument2. ERIC EJ 158 476.

Willard, C. A. (1978). A reformulation of the nature of argument: A constructivist/interactionist view of the sociology of argument. JAFA, 14, 121-40. A constructivist interpretation of argument as interaction.

Traditional Perspectives on Argument

Benoit, W. L. (1980). Aristotle's example: The rhetorical induction. QJS, 66, 182-92. Argues that Aristotle's example is the rhetorical species of induction, reasoning from part through an implicit whole to another part.

Bitzer, L. F. (1959). Aristotle's enthymeme revisited. QJS, 55, 265-75. Defines the enthymeme as a syllogism based on probablities, signs, and examples, which persuades through collaboration of speaker and audience.

Conley, T. C. (1978). 'Logical hylomorhism' and Aristotle's koinoi toipoi. CSSJ, 29, 307-23. Argues against distinguishing topoi by form and content.

Conley, T. C. (1984). The enthymeme in perspective. QJS, 70, 168-87. Historical review of conceptions of the enthymeme arguing that it is more than a form of syllogistic inference.

Dieter, O. A. L. (1950). Stasis. SM, 35, 90-108. Explanation of the nature of stasis in ancient

Greek rhetoric.

Ochs, D. J. (1969). Aristotle's concept of formal topics. SM, 36, 419-25. A dialectical topic is a relationship between predicates and subjects; rhetorical topics are argument forms, relationships between terms, propositions, or past, present, and future events.

Argument Diagrams

Brockriede, W., & Ehninger, D. (1960). Toulmin on argument: An interpretation and application. QJS, 46, 534-39. Early explication of the layout of arguments.

Burleson, B. R. (1979). On the analysis and criticism of arguments: Some theoretical and methodological considerations. JAFA, 15, 137-47. Argues that Willard (1976) criticizes argument diagrams for inability to model argument2, a task they were not intended to do. ERIC EJ 210 715.

Hample, D. (1977). The Toulmin model and the syllogism. JAFA, 14, 1-9. Argues that the Toulmin model is not inherently superior to the syllogism.

Willard, C. A. (1976). On the utility of descriptive diagrams for the analysis and criticism of arguments. CM, 43, 308-19. Argues that the Toulmin model is inappropriate for depicting everyday argument.

Perelman

Dearin, R. D. (1969). The philosophical bases of Chaim Perelman's theory of rhetoric. QJS, 55, 213-24. Discusses Perelman's philosohical assumptions, ranging beyond The New Rhetoric. Discussion of philodophical assumptions, epistemology, judicial approach to rationality, and rhetorical reasons.

Perelman, C. (1984). The new rhetoric and the rhetoricians: Remembrances and comments. QJS, 70, 188-96. Corrects misconceptions about his theory, and stresses his notion that law is to rhetoric as mathematics is to formal logic. ERIC EJ 299 349.

Rotenstreich, N. (1972). Argumentation and philosophical clarification. P&R, 5, 12-23. A perspective on the philosophical assumptions of Perelman.

Evaluating Argument

Ehninger, D. (1968). Validity as moral obligation. SSJ, 33, 215-22. To be valid, a case must cause an opponent to significantly alter position, of necessity, and with awareness of the alteration and reasons for it.

Fisher, W. R. (1980). Rationality and the logic of good reasons. P&R, 13, 121-30. Good reasons are encouraged by discourse that is self-perpetuating, not manipulative bilateral, deliberative, reflexive, and mindful to evidence. ERIC ED 177 643.

McKerrow, R. E. (1977). Rhetorical validity: An analysis of three perspectives on the justification of rhetorical argument. JAFA, 13, 133-41. Argues that standards of validity assume that arguments justify rather than verify claims, and identifies three common assumptions. ERIC EJ 158 478.

Rowland, R. C. (1985). On argument evaluation. JAFA, 21, 123-32. Argues that standards for argument evaluation can be justified on their utility (pragmatic evaluation of outcomes). ERIC EJ 318 137.

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1982). Unexpresed premises: Part I. JAFA, 18, 97-106. Articulates a procedure for making explicit unexpressed premises; continued in Part II.

Van Eemeren F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1983). Unexpressed premises: Part II. JAFA, 19, 215-25. Continuation of Part I.

Argument Fields

Rowland, R. C. (1982). The influence of purpose on fields of argument. JAFA, 18, 228-45. Argues that purpose influences other characteristics of argument fields, so this conception is useful for identifying and studying fields.

Willard, C. A. (1981). Argument fields and theories of logical types. JAFA, 17, 129-45. Argues that argument fields are sociological entities and that it is inappropriate to define them on the basis of logical types.

Zarefsky, D. (1982). Some persistent questions in the theory of argument fields. JAFA, 18, 191-203. Discusses issues of the purpose, nature, and development of fields.

Argument and Attitude Change

Hample, D. (1979). Predicting belief and belief change using a cognitive theory of argument and evidence. CM, 46, 142-46. Articulates and tests an information integration approach to prediction of belief change from arguments and evidence.

Kellerman, K. (1980). The concept of evidence: A critical review. JAFA, 16, 159-72. Critical review of reseach on persuasiveness of evidence. ERIC EJ 225 081.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1984). The effects of involvement on responses to argument quantity and quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. JPSP, 46, 69-81. Number of arguments is more important on uninvolving topics, while strength of argument is more important on highly involving topics.

Argument in Interaction

Benoit, P. J. (1983). Extended argument in children's discourse. JAFA, 20, 72-89. Structural analysis of argument2's in children's discourse. ERIC EJ 301 203.

Jackson, S., & Jacobs, S. (1980). Structure of conversational argument: Pragmatic bases for the enthymeme. QJS, 66, 251-65. Description of everyday argument as collaborative productions of conventional structure, with enthymematic properties.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1981). Argument as a natural category: The routine grounds for arguing in conversation. WJSC, 45, 118-33. Discussion of naturalistic argument, concluding that argument is distinguished by function (disagreement management) and form (speech act expansion). ERIC EJ 245488.

CM Communication Monographs
JAFA Journal of the American Forensic Association
PAR Philosophy & Rhetoric
SSJ Southern Speech Journal
WJSC Western Journal of Speech Communication
CSSJ Central States Speech Journal
JPSP Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
QJS Quarterly Journal of Speech
SM Speech Monographs

Entries followed by ERIC EJ numbers are journal articles indexed in Current Index to Journals in Education. These articles can be obtained from your librarian; in most cases, reprints can also be purchased from University Microfilms International.
Entries followed by ERIC ED numbers are documents announced in Resources in Education. These documents can be read on microfiche in libraries housing ERIC collections. For ordering information, check the latest issue of RIE in your library.